

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-31 are pending in the present application. By this reply, claim 6 has been canceled. Claims 1, 9 and 15 are independent.

The claims have been amended to clarify the invention according to U.S. patent practice. These modifications do not add new matter.

35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 12, 15, 18-23, 25-26, 28-29 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Smyers (U.S. Patent 6,430,629). Claims 2, 11, 13, 16 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smyers in view of Dara-Abrams et al. Claims 7, 14 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smyers in view of Klosterman et al. Claims 8, 10, 24 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smyers in view of Aizu et al. These rejections, insofar as they pertain to the presently pending claims, are respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claim 1, “a master device” has been changed to “a television receiver” to further emphasize the distinguishing features of the present invention over the prior art of record. The primary reference, Smyers, discloses as shown in Figure 1 a 1394 home network monitor which is connected to various nodes in the home network. However, Smyers fails to teach or suggest a television receiver (replacing the term “a master device” in claim 1) that is operatively connected to at least one slave device and comprising the various elements and their functions as recited in claim 1. Other independent claims 9 and 15 also recite similar features in a varying scope.

Furthermore, the secondary references are relied on for allegedly teaching the features recited in the dependent claims and do not teach or suggest each and every specific features associated with the television receiver as recited in independent claims 1, 9 and 15.

Therefore, Smyers either taken singularly or in combination with the other references fails to teach or render obvious the claim invention. Accordingly, claims 1, 9 and 15 and their

Application No. 10/777,655
Amendment dated March 15, 2007
Reply to Office Action of November 15, 2006

Docket No.: 0465-1148P

dependent claims (due to the dependency) are patentable over the applied references, and the rejections should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Esther H. Chong Reg. No. 40,953 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 15, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Esther Chong
Esther H. Chong
Registration No.: 40,953
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant